

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1-30 were rejected. By the present response, claims 3 and 4 have been cancelled and claims 1, 5, 6, 12, 17, 19, and 24 have been amended. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1, 2, and 5-30 will remain pending in the present patent application. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6, 8-18, and 20-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wood, U.S. Patent No. 5,894,266. Claims 3 and 4 have been cancelled and claims 1, 5, 6, 12, 17, and 24 have been amended by this response. For the reasons provided below, claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8-18, and 20-26 are not anticipated by the Wood reference.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8-11 and 27-30

The Wood reference does not anticipate amended independent claim 1 because the Wood reference does not disclose all of the recited features of the claim. Amended independent claim 1 recites the following:

1. A wireless communication system, comprising:
 - a programmable interface coupleable between a sensing device and a transmitter, wherein the interface is operable to receive sensing device data from the sensing device and to be programmed to process the sensing device data at a desired interval to maintain a running total of a desired parameter and to provide the running total of the desired parameter and the desired interval to the transmitter for transmission; and
 - a programming station selectively coupleable to the interface to enable a user to program the interface to establish the desired interval.

Among the recited features of claim 1 that are not disclosed by the Wood reference is: “a programmable interface...operable...to be programmed to process the sensing device data at a desired interval to maintain a running total of a desired parameter.” The Wood reference discloses a host computer 10 that communicates across a given communication medium 18 with a remote intelligence communications device 14. *See Wood, col. 3, lines 44-48.* In addition, the remote intelligence communications device 14 has first and second digital interfacing ports 84₁ and 84₂ for communication with a navigation receiver 88 and an additional device. *See Wood, col. 9, lines 11-24.* The Wood reference discloses that the remote intelligence communications device 14 has wake-up circuitry 82 that minimizes the amount of current drawn from a battery 83 within the remote intelligence communications device 14 during a sleep mode of operation. *See Wood, col. 8, lines 47-49.*

The Wood reference discloses wake-up circuitry 83 that senses when an RF input signal is received by a receiver 66 within a remote intelligent communication device 14 and activates other portions of the device 14 upon receipt of a valid RF input signal. *See Wood, col. 8, lines 25-29.* In an alternative embodiment, the remote intelligence communications device 14 includes a self-timer that times out at the end of a sleep mode, whereby the receiver 66 and clock and data recovery circuitry 68 are enabled. *See Wood, col. 8, lines 35-38.* Once these portions have been enabled, the wake-up circuitry does not enable additional portions of the remote intelligent communications device 14 for full operation *until* a valid RF input signal is received. *See Wood, col. 8, lines 40-44.* Thus, in each of these embodiments, the receipt of a valid RF input, not the self-timer, determines when the remote intelligent communication device 14 is operable to process any data from the navigation receiver 88 or any additional device.

Furthermore, the Wood reference does not disclose that the remote intelligent communication device 14 maintains a running total of a desired parameter. The Examiner admitted this in section four of the Office Action. Specifically, the Examiner,

referring to claim 27, which already recited a similar feature, stated that: “Wood differs from claim 27 by not disclosing programming the interface ‘cumulative total of a selected device parameter’ to the transmitter.” In addition, the Examiner stated in the Office Action that:

Wood also teaches the use of a Micron Microstamp™ device such as the one described in patent US 6130602 A by O’Toole for use as the intelligent communication device, which contains memory, algorithmic logic units, and control registers for performing control functions such as that of addition and accumulation (Col. 4, lines 25-31).

However, neither the Wood reference nor the O’Toole reference discloses processing data from the navigation receiver 88, or any other device, at a desired interval to maintain a running total of a desired parameter. The Wood reference does not disclose that the arithmetic logic units are used for “accumulation”, as suggested by the Examiner. In reality, arithmetic logic units may be used for many purposes. More specifically, it is not inherent that a running total of a desired parameter is maintained simply because of the presence of an arithmetic logic unit. Thus, the Wood reference does not disclose “a programmable interface...operable...to be programmed to process the sensing device data at a desired interval to maintain a running total of a desired parameter,” as recited in amended independent claim 1. Similarly, the Wood reference fails to disclose “operating the programming station to configure the programming of the programmable interface to provide *a cumulative total of a selected device parameter* to the transmitter,” as recited in claim 27.

Another recited feature of claim 1 that is not disclosed by the Wood reference is: “a programmable interface...operable...to provide the running total of the desired parameter and the desired interval to the transmitter for transmission.” Neither reference discloses providing the running total of the desired parameter and the desired interval to a transmitter for transmission. As discussed above, the Wood reference does not disclose

maintaining a running total of a desired parameter. However, even if the Wood reference discloses processing sensing device data at a desired interval, the Wood reference does not disclose that the remote intelligent communication device 14 provides the desired interval to the transmitter 66 for transmission. Thus, the Wood reference does not disclose: “a programmable interface...operable...to provide the running total of the desired parameter *and the desired interval* to the transmitter for transmission.”

Therefore, the Wood reference does not disclose all of the recited features of amend independent claim 1, or independent claim 27. Accordingly, claims 1 and 27 are not anticipated by the Wood reference. Claims 2, 5, 6, and 8-11 depend from claim 1 and claims 28-30 depend from claim 27. Therefore, claims 2, 5, 6, 8-11, and 28-30 also are not anticipated by the Wood reference.

Claims 12-18 and 20-23

The Wood reference also does not anticipate amended independent claim 12 because the Wood reference does not disclose all of the recited features of claim 12. Amended independent claim 12 recites the following:

12. An interface for a wireless communication system, comprising:
a processor, wherein the processor is operable to receive device data from a device and to process the device data at a desired interval according to programming instructions stored in the interface to provide a user-configured stream of device data to a transmitter, wherein the user-configured stream of device data comprises a first portion of data representative of the device data processed by the interface and a second portion of data representative of the desired interval.

One of the recited the recited features of amended independent claim 12 that is not disclosed by the Wood reference is “a processor, wherein the processor is operable to

receive device data from a device and to process the sensing device data at a desired interval according to programming instructions stored in the interface.” As noted above, the remote intelligent communication device 14 of Wood does not process device data at a desired interval, much less process device data according to programming instructions stored in the remote intelligent communication device 14.

In addition, the Wood reference does not disclose providing a user-configured stream of device data, “wherein the user-configured stream of device data comprises a first portion of data representative of the device data processed by the interface and a second portion of data representative of the desired interval,” as recited in claim 12. As discussed above, the Wood reference simply does not disclose that the remote intelligent communication device 14 provides any data to the transmitter 66 that may be construed as “data representative of the desired interval.”

Therefore, Wood does not disclose all of the recited features of amended independent claim 12. Accordingly, claim 12 is not anticipated by the Wood reference. As noted above, claims 13-18 and 20-23 depend from claim 12. Therefore, claims 13-18 and 20-23 also are not anticipated by the Wood reference.

Claims 24-26

In addition, the Wood reference does not anticipate amended independent claim 24 because the Wood reference also does not disclose all of the recited features of the claim. Amended independent claim 24 recites the following:

24. A method of operating a wireless communication system to enable a system user to configure device data communicated by a transmitter coupled to a sensing device via a programmable interface, comprising the acts of:
connecting the programmable interface to a programming station operated by a system user;

identifying a communication protocol utilized by the sensing device from among a plurality of communication protocols operable to be programmed into the programmable interface;

operating the programming station to configure the programming of the programmable interface to receive the device data from the sensing device using the communication protocol utilized by the sensing device and to provide a user-configured stream of device data to the transmitter; and

coupling the programmable interface between the sensing device and the transmitter.

Examples of recited features of claim 24 that are not disclosed by the Wood reference are: “identifying a communication protocol utilized by the sensing device from among a plurality of communication protocols operable to be programmed into the programmable interface” and “operating the programming station to configure the programming of the programmable interface to receive the device data from the sensing device using the communication protocol utilized by the sensing device.”

As noted above, the Wood reference discloses a remote intelligent communication device 14 that has first and second digital interfacing ports 84₁ and 84₂ for communication with a navigation receiver 88 (such as a GPS receiver 88) and an additional device (such as a continuity tester for monitoring a door of a delivery truck 94). *See* Wood, col. 9, lines 11-24. In addition, the Wood reference discloses analog ports 86₁ and 86₂ for receiving analog signals from an analog device (such as an accelerometer 90). However, the Wood reference does not disclose that the communication protocols used by the GPS receiver 88, the additional device 94, or the accelerometer 90 may vary or that the remote intelligent communication device 14 or the communication protocols for these devices are identified from among a plurality of communication protocols operable to be programmed into the remote intelligent communication device 14, or that the remote intelligent communication device 14 may even be programmed to communicate with a plurality of different communication protocols. Just because different devices

communicate with the remote intelligent communication device 14 that does not mean that the different devices use different communication protocols.

Thus, the Wood reference does not disclose “identifying a communication protocol utilized by the sensing device from among a plurality of communication protocols operable to be programmed into the programmable interface” and “operating the programming station to configure the programming of the programmable interface to receive the device data from the sensing device using the communication protocol utilized by the sensing device.” Therefore, Wood does not disclose all of the recited features of amended independent claim 24.

Accordingly, claim 24 is not anticipated by the Wood reference. Claims 25 and 26 depend from claim 24. Therefore, claims 25 and 26 also are not anticipated by the Wood reference.

For all of these reasons, claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8-18, and 20-26 are not anticipated by the Wood reference. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

First Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood in view of Vollmann, U.S. Patent No. 4,561,442. However, it appears from the text of the rejection that the Examiner intended to reject claim 27 instead of claim 7. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 27 is patentable over the cited references because the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all of the recited features of the claim. As noted above, the Wood reference does not disclose “operating the programming station to configure the programming of the programmable interface to provide a cumulative total

of a selected device parameter to the transmitter" and "coupling the programmable interface between the medical asset and the transmitter," as recited in amended independent claim 27. As noted above, the Examiner stated in the rejection that: "Wood differs from claim 27 by not disclosing programming the interface 'cumulative total of a selected device parameter' to the transmitter." However, the Vollmann reference also fails to disclose or suggest this recited feature. In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that:

Vollmann discloses a programmable medical interface that interfaces between a medical device (pacer) over lead 14 and telemetry transmitter/transponder 30 in fig. 1 and col. 6 lines 15-60. Vollmann disclosing programming the interface "cumulative total of a selected device parameter" to the transmitter in col. 3 lines 340-48 and col. 4 lines 15-31 and col. 28 lines 51-60. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included in Wood the programming the interface "cumulative total of a selected device parameter" to the transmitter disclosed by Vollmann in order to allow observation of how well a device is working and is suggested by col. 10 line 34 of Wood discussing accumulated data.

However, the Examiner does not identify the "programmable medical interface" that is allegedly disclosed in Vollmann. The Vollmann reference does disclose a multi-programmable cardiac pacer. However, Vollmann does not disclose an interface between a medical asset and a transmitter. Instead, the multi-programmable cardiac pacer is, in effect, "the medical asset." Thus, even if the multi-programmable cardiac pacer is programmed to provide a "cumulative total of a selected device parameter," it is not suggestive of "operating the programming station to configure the programming of the programmable interface to provide a cumulative total of a selected device parameter to the transmitter" and "coupling the programmable interface between the medical asset and the transmitter," as recited in amended independent claim 27.

Accordingly, claim 27 also is patentable over the Wood and Vollmann references. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner intended to reject claim 7, then the claim 7 is patentable because of its dependence from claim 1. As noted above, the Wood reference does not disclose all of the recited features of amended independent claim 1. The Vollmann reference does not obviate the deficiencies of the Wood reference in regard to claim 1. Therefore, the cited references do not disclose or suggest all of the recited features of claim 1, or claim 7, which depends therefrom. Accordingly, claim 7 also is patentable over the Wood reference. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Second Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 7 depends from amended independent claim 1. For the reasons provided above, amended independent claim 1 is patentable over the Wood reference. Accordingly, claim 7, which depends therefrom, also is patentable over the Wood reference. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Third Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103


Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 19 depends from amended independent claim 12. For the reasons discussed above, amended independent claim 12 is patentable over the Wood reference. Accordingly, claim 19 also is patentable over the Wood reference. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 12, 2004



Patrick S. Yoder
Reg. No. 37,479
FLETCHER YODER
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289
(281) 970-4545